Appln. No. 10/632,352 Attorney Docket No: DKT91043H

Response to Final Office Action of 04-25-08

II. Remarks

Claims 109-119, 122-127, 129-131, 133-134, 136-141 and 143-147 are pending

in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination of these claims is respectfully

requested.

Claims 145-147

Claims 145-147 were not indicated in the Office Action as being under

consideration. It is believed that this is merely an oversight in the Office Action since

these claims were the subject of the examiner's Office Action dated January 18, 2008

and Applicants' Response thereto. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 145-147 are

pending in the present application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 114, 117, 129 and 136 were objected to as being dependent upon a

rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten into independent

form. By way of this Amendment, Applicants have rewritten claims 114, 117, 129 and

136 in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims. Since a dependent claim inherently includes all of the limitations of

its base and intervening claims, the amendments are properly considered non-

narrowing amendments.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are now in condition

for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited.

Claim Objections

Claim 125 was objected to because of an informality. Appropriate correction has

been made. Specifically, claim 125 has been amended at line 3 to read "time intervals"

pursuant to the examiner's suggestion.

BRINKS HOFER GILSON &LIONE

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione Ann Arbor, Michigan -10-

Attorney Docket No: DKT91043H Appln. No. 10/632,352

Response to Final Office Action of 04-25-08

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 142 and 144 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 142 has been cancelled and claim 144

amended to correct the ambiguity noted by the examiner.

Claim Rejections

Claims 108-110, 113, 115, 116, 118-122, 125-127, 130-135, 137, 138 and 141-

143 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S.

Patent 4,989,686 ("Miller"). Claims 111, 112, 123, 124, 139, 140 and 144 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller.

With the rewriting of claims 114, 117, 129 and 126 into independent form, claims

108, 120 and 132 have been cancelled and the dependencies of the remaining claims

corrected to depend from the newly independent claims. Since the remaining claims

now depend from allowable base claims, it is submitted that the remaining claims are

allowable at least for the same reasons as their base claims. Such action is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit

that the objections and rejections should be withdrawn and that this application is now in

condition for allowance. If the examiner believes a telephone conversation would

expedite this application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at

734-302-6038.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric J. Sosenko/

Eric J. Sosenko

Registration No. 34,440

Attorney for Applicants

734-302-6038

BRINKS HOFER GILSON

&LIONE

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione Ann Arbor, Michigan

-11-